

INTEGRATING HASSE-SCHMIDT DERIVATIONS

DANIEL HOFFMANN[†] AND PIOTR KOWALSKI[♣]

ABSTRACT. We study integrating (that is expanding to a Hasse-Schmidt derivation) derivations, and more generally truncated Hasse-Schmidt derivations, satisfying iterativity conditions given by formal group laws. Our results generalize a theorem of Matsumura about integrating nilpotent derivations. We also prove a non-integrability result concerning certain derivations on projective line.

1. INTRODUCTION

The algebraic theory of derivations is an important tool in commutative algebra. This theory works better in the characteristic 0 case due to the fact that any derivation vanishes on the set of p -th powers, if the characteristic is $p > 0$. To deal with this problem, Hasse and Schmidt introduced *higher differentiations* [19, p. 224] which we call *HS-derivations* in this paper. An HS-derivation (see Definition 2.1) is a sequence of maps having a usual derivation as its first element. In the case of a $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra, any derivation uniquely expands to an *iterative* HS-derivation (see Definition 2.2) and the two theories coincide.

Matsumura obtained several interesting results about expanding (called *integrating* in [14]) derivations to HS-derivations in the case of positive characteristic. The first result [14, Theorem 6 and Corollary] says that any derivation on a field is (non-uniquely) integrable. The second result [14, Theorem 7] says that a derivation D on a field can be integrated to an iterative HS-derivation (*strongly integrated* in Matsumura's terminology) if and only if composing D with itself p times gives the 0-map. In this paper, we generalize the latter result above.

Analyzing the definition of an iterative HS-derivation, one realizes [14, (1.9) and (1.10)] that the iterativity condition is given by the additive *formal group law* $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_a = X + Y$. It is natural to ask what happens if the additive formal group law is replaced with another formal group law F , e.g. the multiplicative one $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m = X + Y + XY$. Such a replacement naturally leads to a definition of an *F-iterative* HS-derivation, see Definition 2.2. Such derivations were considered before in a more general setting (i.e. on arbitrary schemes), see e.g. [5, Def. 4.2] (for even more general setting, see [17]). In this paper we prove the following multiplicative variant of Matsumura's result [14, Theorem 7] mentioned above.

Theorem 1.1. *Let D be a derivation on a field K of positive characteristic p . Then D can be integrated to a multiplicatively iterative HS-derivation if and only if composing D with itself p times coincides with D .*

[†]AMDG.

[♣]Supported by the Polish grant MEN no. N N201 545938.

In fact, we prove generalizations of both [14, Theorem 7] and Theorem 1.1 (see Theorems 4.7 and 4.11) replacing derivations above with *truncated HS-derivations* (Definition 2.7). In the additive case (corresponding to the usual iterativity) such a generalization is implicit in the work of Ziegler ([22], [23]) and it was crucial to axiomatize the class of *existentially closed* (in the sense of logic, see [8]) iterative HS-fields [23]. The second author also used similar ideas to find *geometric* axioms of this class [11]. It is natural to expect that Theorem 4.11 leads to a similar axiomatization of the class of existentially closed multiplicatively iterative fields with HS-derivations, such topics will be discussed in [9].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we set our notation and introduce iterative HS-derivations, where the iterativity notion comes from a truncated/formal group law. In Section 3, we prove some preparatory results about composing HS-derivations and their fields of constants. In section 4, we prove our theorems about integration of truncated HS-derivations. In Section 5, we rephrase the notion of an iterative HS-derivation in terms of group scheme actions. In Section 6, we use the language of Section 5 to analyze integrability of truncated HS-derivations on projective line. In Section 7, we comment on the “partial” (i.e. several HS-derivations) case.

2. DEFINITIONS AND NOTATION

Let us fix a field k and a k -algebra R . For any function $f : R \rightarrow R$, $r \in R$ and a positive integer n , $f^n(r) = f(r)^n$ and $f^{(n)}$ is the composition of f with itself n times.

2.1. Formal group laws and HS-derivations.

Definition 2.1. A sequence $\partial = (\partial_n : R \rightarrow R)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of additive maps is called an *HS-derivation* if ∂_0 is the identity map, and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x, y \in R$,

$$\partial_n(xy) = \sum_{i+j=n} \partial_i(x)\partial_j(y).$$

If moreover for all $n > 0$ and $x \in k$ we have $\partial_n(x) = 0$, then we call ∂ an *HS-derivation over k* .

For any sequence of maps $\partial = (\partial_n : R \rightarrow R)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a variable X we define a map

$$\partial_X : R \rightarrow R[[X]], \quad \partial_X(r) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \partial_n(r)X^n.$$

It is easy to see [15, p. 207] that ∂ is an HS-derivation if and only if ∂_X is a ring homomorphism and that ∂ is an HS-derivation over k if and only if ∂_X is a k -algebra homomorphism. It is also clear that for a ring homomorphism $\varphi : R \rightarrow R[[X]]$, φ is of the form ∂_X for some derivation ∂ if and only if the composition of φ with the natural projection map $R[[X]] \rightarrow R$ is the identity map.

Definition 2.2. An HS-derivation ∂ is called *iterative* if for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\partial_i \circ \partial_j = \binom{i+j}{i} \partial_{i+j}.$$

Assume that S is a complete local R -algebra and $s_1, \dots, s_k$ belong to the maximal ideal of S . There is a unique R -algebra homomorphism $R[[X_1, \dots, X_k]] \rightarrow S$ such that each X_i is mapped to s_i [4, Theorem 7.16]. We denote this homomorphism by $\text{ev}_{(s_1, \dots, s_k)}$ and for $F \in R[[X_1, \dots, X_k]]$ we often write $F(s_1, \dots, s_k)$ instead of $\text{ev}_{(s_1, \dots, s_k)}(F)$.

It is again easy to see [15, p. 209] that an HS-derivation ∂ is iterative if and only if the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\partial_Y} & R[[Y]] \\ \partial_Z \downarrow & & \downarrow \partial_X[Y] \\ R[[Z]] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{X+Y}} & R[[X, Y]]. \end{array}$$

One could replace the power series $X + Y$ in the definition above with an arbitrary power series in two variables. But it turns out that we get a meaningful definition only in the case when $F \in k[[X, Y]]$ is a *formal group law* (over k) i.e. if it satisfies

$$F(X, 0) = X = F(0, X), \quad F(F(X, Y), Z) = F(X, F(Y, Z)).$$

Remark 2.3. The necessity of the first condition is clear. The necessity of the associativity condition comes from the associativity of the composition of functions together with some diagram chasing, similarly as in the proof of Proposition 3.14.

Example 2.4. We give examples of formal group laws.

- The additive formal group law $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_a = X + Y$.
- The multiplicative formal group law $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m = X + Y + XY$.
- More generally, any one-dimensional algebraic group G over k gives (after choosing a local parameter at $1 \in G(k)$) a formal group law called the *formalization* of G (see [13, Section 2.2]) and denoted by $\widehat{G}$.
- For any $n > 0$, there is a formal group law $\bar{F}_{\Delta_n}$ (see [7, 3.2.3]) over $\mathbb{F}_p$. If $n > 2$, then this formal group law does not come from the formalization of an algebraic group.

Let us fix F , a formal group law over k .

Definition 2.5. An HS-derivation ∂ over k is called *F-iterative* if the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\partial_Y} & R[[Y]] \\ \partial_Z \downarrow & & \downarrow \partial_X[Y] \\ R[[Z]] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_F} & R[[X, Y]]. \end{array}$$

We shorten the long phrase “ F -iterative HS-derivation over k ” to *F-derivation*.

For a one-dimensional algebraic group G over k we use the term *G-derivation* rather than $\widehat{G}$ -derivation. In particular, a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation is the same as an iterative HS-derivation.

If F' is also a formal group law and t is a variable, then $\alpha \in tk[[t]]$ is called a homomorphism between F and F' , denoted $\alpha : F \rightarrow F'$, if

$$\alpha(F(X, Y)) = F'(\alpha(X), \alpha(Y)).$$

Remark 2.6. Assume that $\text{char}(k) = 0$. Then any derivation D on R uniquely expands to a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation $(D^{(n)}/n!)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Therefore the theory of derivations coincides with the theory of iterative HS-derivations. Considering other formal group laws does not change this theory either, since by [7, Theorem 1.6.2] each formal group law F over k is isomorphic to $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}_a$, and such an isomorphism gives a bijective correspondence (see Lemma 3.2 which is also true for k of characteristic 0) between $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivations and F -derivations.

Therefore, from now on we assume that $\text{char}(k) = p > 0$, but sometimes we will make comments regarding the characteristic 0 case.

2.2. Truncated HS-derivations. Let us fix a natural number $m > 0$.

Definition 2.7. A sequence $\partial = (\partial_n : R \rightarrow R)_{n < p^m}$ of additive maps is called an *m-truncated HS-derivation* if ∂_0 is the identity, and for all $n < p^m$ and $x, y \in R$,

$$\partial_n(xy) = \sum_{i+j=n} \partial_i(x)\partial_j(y).$$

If moreover for all $0 < n < p^m$ and $x \in k$ we have $\partial_n(x) = 0$, then we call ∂ an *m-truncated HS-derivation over k*.

Let v_m, w_m, u_m (or just v, w, u if m is clear from the context) denote the “*m*-truncated variables” e.g.

$$R[v_m] = R[X]/(X^{p^m}), \quad R[v_m, w_m, u_m] = R[X]/(X^{p^m}, Y^{p^m}, Z^{p^m}).$$

For any sequence of maps $\partial = (\partial_n : R \rightarrow R)_{n < p^m}$ we define a map

$$\partial_{v_m} : R \rightarrow R[v_m], \quad \partial_{v_m}(r) = \sum_{n=0}^{p^m-1} \partial_n(r)v_m^n.$$

It is easy to see again that ∂ is an *m*-truncated HS-derivation if and only if ∂_{v_m} is a ring homomorphism and that ∂ is an HS-derivation over k if and only if ∂_{v_m} is a k -algebra homomorphism.

Since for all $i, j < p^m$ if $i + j \geq p^m$ then $\binom{i+j}{i}\partial_{i+j} = 0$, we can define *iterative m-truncated HS-derivations* exactly as in Definition 2.2.

Remark 2.8. If $\partial = (\partial_i)_{i < p^m}$ is an iterative *m*-truncated HS-derivation, then ∂_1 is a derivation such that $\partial_1^{(p)} = 0$ (see [15, page 209] or a more general Remark 3.15). Conversely, if D is a derivation such that $D^{(p)} = 0$, then $(D^{(i)}/i!)_{i < p}$ is an iterative 1-truncated HS-derivation. Thus there is a natural bijective correspondence between the set of derivations D such that $D^{(p)} = 0$ and the set of iterative 1-truncated HS-derivations.

The notion of iterativity in the truncated case can be explained again in terms of diagrams. Before this explanation we need some comments about the truncated evaluation maps. If S is any R algebra and $s \in S$ such that $s^{p^m} = 0$, then there is a unique R -algebra map $\text{ev}_s : R[v_m] \rightarrow S$ such that $\text{ev}_s(v_m) = s$. Again, for $f \in R[v_m]$ we sometimes write $f(s)$ for $\text{ev}_s(f)$. Similarly in the case of several truncated variables. An *m*-truncated HS-derivation ∂ is iterative if and only if the

following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\partial_w} & R[w] \\ \partial_u \downarrow & & \downarrow \partial_v[w] \\ R[u] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{v+w}} & R[v, w], \end{array}$$

where $v = v_m, w = w_m, u = u_m$ (note that $(v + w)^{p^m} = 0$).

Again, we can replace $v + w$ with any m -truncated polynomial $f \in k[v, w]$, but to get a meaningful definition (see Remark 2.3) we need f to be an *m-truncated group law* i.e. it should satisfy

$$f(v, 0) = v = f(0, v), \quad f(f(v, w), u) = f(v, f(w, u)).$$

- Remark 2.9.** (1) Note that the condition $f(v, 0) = v = f(0, v)$ is equivalent to saying that f belongs to the maximal ideal of $k[v, w]$, which in turn is equivalent to the condition $f^{p^m} = 0$. Therefore, for a truncated group law f , the evaluation map ev_f makes sense.
- (2) There is a classical notion of a (*commutative*) *one dimensional formal group chunk of order n* (see [7, Def. 5.7.1]), which in our positive characteristic case coincides with the notion of an m -truncated group law for $n = p^m$. However in the case of characteristic 0, these two notions differ: there are plenty of formal group chunks, but (see (3) below) no truncated group laws.
- (3) We will see in Section 5 that such an f gives a *k-group scheme* structure on $\text{Spec}(k[v])$. If $\text{char}(k) = 0$, then there are no group scheme structures on $k[X]/(X^n)$, see Remark 5.1.

Let us fix f , an m -truncated formal group law.

Definition 2.10. An m -iterative HS-derivation ∂ over k is called *f-iterative* if the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\partial_w} & R[w] \\ \partial_u \downarrow & & \downarrow \partial_v[w] \\ R[u] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_f} & R[v, w] \end{array}$$

where $v = v_m, w = w_m, u = u_m$.

We shorten a long phrase “ f -iterative m -truncated HS-derivation over k ” to *f-derivation*.

Let l be a positive integer and let us also take g , an l -truncated formal group law. We define a homomorphism between truncated group laws f and g , denoted by $\alpha : f \rightarrow g$, as an element $\alpha \in k[v_m]$ satisfying

$$\alpha^{p^l} = 0, \quad \alpha(f(v_m, w_m)) = g(\alpha(v_m), \alpha(w_m)).$$

2.3. Truncating HS-derivations and Frobenius. We recall that F is a formal group law over k and $m > 0$. Let us define

$$F[m] := F(v_m, w_m) \in k[v_m, w_m].$$

It is clear that (see also [13, Lemma 1.1]) $F[m]$ is an m -truncated group law. For any 1-dimensional algebraic group G over k , we use the term “ $G[m]$ -derivation” rather than “ $\widehat{G}[m]$ -derivation” (see also Section 5.2). In particular, we sometimes say $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivations for iterative m -truncated HS-derivations.

Assume that f is an m -truncated group law and take $1 \leq l \leq m$. We define

$$f[l] := f(v_l, w_l) \in k[v_l, w_l].$$

Then $f[l]$ is an l -truncated group law. Clearly this construction coincides with the previous one i.e.

$$F[m][l] = F[l].$$

We also have a natural homomorphism $v_l : f[l] \rightarrow f$ of truncated group laws. In particular we can understand F as the limit of the direct system of truncated group schemes $(F[l])_{l>0}$ (see [13, Lemma 1.1] or Section 5).

Remark 2.11. The situation is very different in the characteristic 0 case, since there are no truncated group laws then (see Remark 2.9(4)) and a formal group law can not be approximated by truncated ones.

Let $j := m - l$. Then $v_m^{p^j}$ need *not* be a homomorphism $f \rightarrow f[l]$ of truncated group laws unless f is defined over the prime field $\mathbb{F}_p$. For any field automorphism $\varphi : k \rightarrow k$ and $g = \sum_{n < p^m} c_n v_m^n \in k[v_m]$, we denote by g^φ the truncated polynomial $\sum_{n < p^m} \varphi(c_n) v_m^n$. Similarly for power series. Let Fr denote the Frobenius automorphism of k . Then g is a truncated group law if and only if g^φ is (similarly for formal group laws). Therefore $f^{\text{Fr}^{-j}}$ is an m -truncated group law and $v_m^{p^j} : f^{\text{Fr}^{-j}} \rightarrow f[l]$ (similarly for formal group laws).

3. ALGEBRAIC PROPERTIES OF F -DERIVATIONS

We assume that k is a perfect field of positive characteristic p and R is a k -algebra. We also fix a formal group law F over k , a positive integer m and an m -truncated group law f .

3.1. Morphisms of group laws and HS-derivations. As any formal group law over a field is necessarily commutative [7, Theorem 1.6.7], an F -derivation $\partial = (\partial_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $\partial_i \circ \partial_j = \partial_j \circ \partial_i$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. We will use this fact often.

Remark 3.1. There are also consequences of the existence of the “inverse map” i.e. a power series W such that $F(X, W(X)) = 0$. There is a group operation on the set of HS-derivations on R over k defined as follows

$$(\partial * \partial')_n = \sum_{i+j=n} \partial_i \circ \partial'_j$$

(see [14, page 208]). For an F -derivation ∂ , the inverse of ∂ (with respect to the group operation above) can be expressed in terms of W , e.g. if ∂ is a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation, then the inverse of ∂ coincides with $((-1)^n \partial_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

The two statements below connect homomorphisms of truncated/formal group laws with iterative derivations. Note that homomorphisms on the formal group level go the *opposite* direction to k -algebra homomorphisms (since the category of complete Hopf algebras is opposite to the category of formal groups, see Section 5).

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $\alpha : F \rightarrow F'$ is a homomorphism of formal group laws over k and we have the following commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R[[X]] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_\alpha} & R[[X]] \\ & \nwarrow (\partial')_X \quad \nearrow \partial_X & \\ & R. & \end{array}$$

- (1) *If ∂' is an F' -derivation, then ∂ is an F -derivation.*
- (2) *If ∂ is an F -derivation and ev_α is one-to-one (equivalently, $\alpha \neq 0$), then ∂' is an F' -derivation.*

Proof. This is a relatively easy diagram chase which we leave to the reader. In Section 5, we will also see that it corresponds to well-known facts about pushing out and pulling back group actions by group homomorphisms (the injectivity condition on ev_α corresponds to being a group epimorphism). $\square$

Remark 3.3. Lemma 3.2 remains true if we replace formal group laws by truncated group laws (of course the injectivity is not equivalent anymore to being non-zero). It is also true for k of characteristic 0.

Corollary 3.4. *Assume that $0 < l \leq m$ and $j = m - l$.*

- (1) *If ∂ is an F -derivation on R , then $\partial' = (\partial_i)_{i < p^m}$ is an $F[m]$ -derivation.*
- (2) *If ∂ is an f -derivation on R , then $\partial' = (\partial_i)_{i < p^l}$ is an $f[l]$ -derivation.*
- (3) *Assume that ∂ is an F -derivation on R , such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ nondivisible by p^m , we have $\partial_n = 0$. Let $F' = F^{\text{Fr}^m}$ and $\partial' = (\partial_{ip^m})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then ∂' is an F' -derivation.*
- (4) *Assume that ∂ is an f -derivation on R , such that for any $n < p^m$ nondivisible by p^j , we have $\partial_n = 0$. Let $f' = f^{\text{Fr}^j}$ and $\partial' = (\partial_{ip^j})_{i < p^l}$. Then ∂' is an $f'[l]$ -derivation.*

Proof. The proofs of (1) and (2) are straightforward. For the proof of (3) consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R[[X]] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{X^{p^m}}} & R[[X]] \\ & \nwarrow (\partial')_X \quad \nearrow \partial_X & \\ & R. & \end{array}$$

By the last paragraph of Section 2.3, $X^{p^m} : F \rightarrow F'$ is a homomorphism of formal group laws and clearly $\text{ev}_{X^{p^m}}$ is one-to-one. By Lemma 3.2, ∂' is an F' -derivation. The proof of (4) is analogous to the proof of (3) (using Remark 3.3), since the homomorphism

$$\text{ev}_{v_m^{p^j}} : k[v_l] \rightarrow k[v_m]$$

is injective. $\square$

Remark 3.5. (1) This paper is concerned with the *opposite* operation to the one appearing in Corollary 3.4(1): we take an $F[m]$ -derivation and we aim to integrate (i.e. expand) it to an F -derivation.

- (2) One may ask whether any m -truncated group law f can be integrated i.e. whether there is a formal group law F such that $F[m] = f$. The answer is positive if and only if f is commutative [7, Corollary 5.7.4] (see [7, Example 5.7.8] for an example of a non-commutative f).
- (3) We will see (Corollary 3.22) that the vanishing condition in (3) above is equivalent to the vanishing of ∂_{p^i} for $i = 0, \dots, m-1$. Similarly in (4) above.

3.2. Canonical F -derivation. One could wonder whether non-zero F -derivations exist at all. The next result provides a canonical example. Let t denote a variable which will play a somewhat different role than the variables X, Y, Z .

Proposition 3.6. *Consider the map*

$$\text{ev}_{F(t,X)} : R[[t]] \rightarrow R[[t, X]].$$

There is an F -derivation ∂ on $R[[t]]$ over R such that $\partial_X = \text{ev}_{F(t,X)}$.

Proof. The composition of $\text{ev}_{F(t,X)}$ with the projection map $R[[t, X]] \rightarrow R[[t]]$ is exactly the map $\text{ev}_{F(t,0)}$. Since $F(t,0) = t$, this composition is the identity map. Thus there is an HS-derivation ∂ over R on $R[[t]]$ such that $\partial_X = \text{ev}_{F(t,X)}$. It remains to check the F -iterativity condition, i.e. the commutativity of the following diagram (see Definition 2.5)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R[[t]] & \xrightarrow{\partial_Y} & R[[t, Y]] \\ \partial_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \partial_X[Y] \\ R[[t, X]] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_F} & R[[t, X, Y]]. \end{array}$$

Note that ev_F is an $R[[t]]$ -algebra map. We will interpret all the maps in the diagram above as evaluation maps on power series R -algebras. We have:

$$\partial_X = \text{ev}_{F(t,X)}, \quad \partial_Y = \text{ev}_{F(t,Y)}, \quad \partial_X[Y] = \text{ev}_{(F(t,X),Y)}, \quad \text{ev}_F = \text{ev}_{(t,F(X,Y))}.$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\partial_X[Y] \circ \partial_Y = \text{ev}_{F(F(t,X),Y)}, \quad \text{ev}_F \circ \partial_X = \text{ev}_{F(t,F(X,Y))}.$$

Hence the commutativity of the diagram above is equivalent to the associativity axiom for the formal group law F . $\square$

Example 3.7. For $F = \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_a = X + Y$ and ∂ the canonical F -derivation on $k[[t]]$, we see that $\partial_1 = \frac{d}{dt}$ is the usual derivative with respect to the variable t and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\partial_n \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i t^i \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_{i+n} \binom{i+n}{n} t^i.$$

The formula above appears already in [6] (last line on p. 50). It is clear that ∂ restricts to the polynomial ring $k[t]$.

Example 3.8. For $F = \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m = X + Y + XY$ and ∂ the canonical F -derivation on $k[[t]]$, one can compute (similarly as in Example 3.20) that

$$\partial_n \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i t^i \right) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\min(m,n)} \frac{(m+n-j)!}{(m-j)!(n-j)!j!} a_{m+n-j} t^m.$$

Clearly, this HS-derivation restricts to the polynomial ring $k[t]$ as well.

It is natural to ask the following question for an arbitrary formal group law F .

Question 3.9. Does the canonical F -derivation on $k[[t]]$ restrict to $k[t]$ or at least (after extending to the field of Laurent series $k((t))$) to $k(t)$?

Remark 3.10. The canonical F -derivation restricts to $k[t]$ if and only if $F \in k[X][[Y]]$.

Example 3.11. It can be checked that the formulas below

$$\partial_1(t) = 1, \partial_2(t) = t^2, \partial_3(t) = 0, \partial_4(t) = t^6 + t^{12},$$

$$\partial_5(t) = 0, \partial_6(t) = t^4, \partial_7(t) = 0$$

give an $F[3]$ -derivation on $\mathbb{F}_2[t]$ for $F = \overline{F}_{\Delta_2}(X, Y)$ from [7, 3.2.3].

3.3. Composing HS-derivations. In this subsection we describe a passage from the diagram describing F -iterativity (Definition 2.5) to formulas for the actual composition of terms of an F -derivation. The p -th compositional power will play a special role.

Let $\partial = (\partial_0, \partial_1, \dots)$ be an HS-derivation on R . For each $i \geq 1$, let

$$E_i : R[[X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}]] \rightarrow R[[X_1, \dots, X_i]], \quad E_i = \partial_{X_i}[[X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}]].$$

In particular $E_1 = \partial_{X_1}$. For any $m \geq 1$, let $E_{(m)}$ denote the composition of the maps below:

$$R \xrightarrow{E_1} R[[X_1]] \xrightarrow{E_2} R[[X_1, X_2]] \xrightarrow{E_3} \dots \xrightarrow{E_m} R[[X_1, \dots, X_m]] \xrightarrow{\text{ev}(X, \dots, X)} R[[X]].$$

Then the map $E_{(m)} : R \rightarrow R[[X]]$ coincides with $(\partial^{*m})_X$, where $\partial^{*m} = \partial * \dots * \partial$ (m times) for the group operation $*$ on the set of HS-derivations on R from Remark 3.1.

Lemma 3.12. *For any $r \in R$ we have:*

$$E_{(p)}(r) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \partial_i^{(p)}(r) X^{pi}.$$

Proof. We have

$$E_{(p)}(r) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i_1 + \dots + i_p = n} (\partial_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ \partial_{i_p})(r) X^i.$$

Since all the maps ∂_i commute with each other, the lemma follows from the fact that the number of different permutations of the sequence $(i_1, \dots, i_p)$ is one if $i_1 = \dots = i_p$ and divisible by p otherwise. $\square$

Corollary 3.13. *Under the assumptions above, $\partial^{(p)} := (\partial_i^{(p)})_i$ is an HS-derivation.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.12, $(\partial^{(p)})_{X^p} = E_{(p)}$, which is a ring homomorphism. $\square$

For an F -derivation ∂ , we aim to express $\partial^{(p)}$ in terms of F and ∂ . For any positive integer m , let

$$[m]_F \in k[[X]], \quad [m+1]_F(X) = F(X, [m]_F(X))$$

be the “multiplication by m map” ($[1]_F = X$).

Proposition 3.14. *If ∂ is an F -derivation, then the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{E_{(m)}} & R[[X]] \\ & \searrow \partial_X & \nearrow \text{ev}_{[m]_F} \\ & R[[X]] & \end{array}$$

Proof. Let F_2 denote $F(X_1, X_2)$ and for $m \geq 2$ let

$$F_{m+1} = F_m(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}, F(X_m, X_{m+1})).$$

By the definitions of $E_{(m)}$ and $[m]_F$, it is enough to prove the following.

Claim

For each $m \geq 2$, the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} R & \xrightarrow{E_1} & R[[X_1]] & \xrightarrow{E_2} & R[[X_1, X_2]] & \xrightarrow{E_3} & \dots \xrightarrow{E_m} R[[X_1, \dots, X_m]] \\ & \searrow E_1 & & & & & \nearrow \text{ev}_{F_m} \\ & & R[[X_1]] & & & & \end{array}$$

Proof of Claim. Induction on m . For $m = 2$ the diagram above is the F -iterativity diagram (Definition 2.5). Assume that $m \geq 2$ and that the diagram above is commutative. Since

$$\text{ev}_{(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}, F(X_m, X_{m+1}))} \circ \text{ev}_{F_m} = \text{ev}_{F_{m+1}},$$

the commutativity of the corresponding diagram for $m + 1$ follows from the commutativity of the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R[[X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}]] & \xrightarrow{E_m} & R[[X_1, \dots, X_m]] \\ \downarrow E_m & & \downarrow E_{m+1} \\ R[[X_1, \dots, X_m]] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}, F(X_m, X_{m+1}))}} & R[[X_1, \dots, X_{m+1}]]. \end{array}$$

The commutativity of this last diagram follows from the application of the functor

$$S \mapsto S[[X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}]]$$

to the F -iterativity diagram after setting $X = X_{m+1}$ and $Y = Z = X_m$. $\square$

Remark 3.15. (1) Note that for a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation ∂ , Proposition 3.14 immediately implies that $\partial^{(p)} = (\text{id}, 0, 0, \dots)$.

(2) After understanding F -iterative HS-derivations as certain group actions (Section 5), one can see that Proposition 3.14 says that for an F -iterative ∂ , ∂^{*m} corresponds to the action given by ∂ precomposed with the map $[m]_F$ (by the remark below Lemma 3.12).

(3) If ∂' is an HS-derivation such that $(\partial')_X = E_{(m)}$, then by Remark 3.3 and Proposition 3.14, ∂' is F -iterative as well (since $[m]_F$ is an endomorphism of the formal group law F).

Proposition 3.16. *If ∂ is an F -derivation, then there is $V \in Xk[[X]]$ such that the following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\partial_X^{(p)}} & R[[X]] \\ & \searrow \partial_X \quad \nearrow \text{ev}_V & \\ & R[[X]] & \end{array}$$

Proof. By [20, Example IV.7.1] (or [3, p. 29 Prop.]), there is a power series V over k such that $[p]_F(X) = V(X^p)$. The result follows using Lemma 3.12 and Proposition 3.14. $\square$

- Remark 3.17.** (1) Note that for $F = X_1 + X_2 + X_1X_2$, the proposition above immediately implies that $\partial^{(p)} = \partial$, since in this case $V = X$.
 (2) For (additively) iterative HS-derivations if $i, j < p^m$ and $i + j \geq p^m$ then $\partial_i \circ \partial_j = 0$. It is not true for other types of iterativity, e.g. $\partial_1 \circ \partial_1 = \partial_1$ for $p = 2$ and a multiplicatively iterative HS-derivation $\partial = (\partial_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$.
 (3) Proposition 3.16 remains true if we replace F -derivations with f -derivations for an m -truncated group law f , just by replacing the ring $R[[X]]$ with $R[X]/(X^{p^m})$ and using [13, Proposition 1.4] instead of [20, Example IV.7.1].

Let us fix $q = p^m$. If $\partial = (\partial_i)_{i < q}$ is an f -derivation, then in general it is difficult to give formulas for $\partial_j \circ \partial_i$. We show below that the general f -iterativity rule resembles the standard (additive) one up to the lower order terms.

Lemma 3.18. *Let ∂ be an f -derivation on R . For every positive integers i, j such that $i + j < q$ we have*

$$\partial_j \circ \partial_i = \binom{i+j}{i} \partial_{i+j} + \mathcal{O}(\partial_{<i+j}),$$

where $\mathcal{O}(\partial_{<i+j})$ is a k -linear combination of the maps $\partial_1, \dots, \partial_{i+j-1}$.

Proof. It follows from the f -iterativity diagram (Definition 2.10) that for any $r \in R$ we have:

$$\sum_{i,j < q} \partial_j(\partial_i(r))v^i w^j = \sum_{n < q} \partial_n(r)f(v, w)^n.$$

Since f is a truncated group law, $f = v + w + s$ for some $s \in k[v, w]$ divisible by vw . Therefore we get

$$\partial_j(\partial_i(x)) = \binom{i+j}{i} \partial_{i+j}(x) + \mathcal{O}(\partial_{<i+j})(x)$$

proving the required equality. $\square$

Remark 3.19. Since for a formal group law F , $F[m]$ is an m -truncated group law, the above lemma is also true for F -derivations (with no restrictions for i, j).

Example 3.20. Assume that ∂ is a $\mathbb{G}_m$ -derivation and $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $r \in R$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} \partial_j(\partial_i(r)) X^i Y^j &= \sum_n \partial_n(r) (X + Y + XY)^n \\ &= \sum_n \partial_n(r) \sum_{a+b \leq n} \frac{n!}{a!b!(n-a-b)!} X^a Y^b (XY)^{n-a-b} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{\min(i,j)} \frac{(i+j-l)!}{(j-l)!l!(i-l)!} \partial_{i+j-l}(r) \right) X^i Y^j. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we get the following multiplicative iterativity rule

$$\partial_j \circ \partial_i = \sum_{n=\max(i,j)}^{i+j} \frac{n!}{(n-i)!(n-j)!(i+j-n)!} \partial_n.$$

The following lemma will help to find “canonical elements” of certain HS-derivations.

Lemma 3.21. *Let ∂, ∂' be f -iterative derivations on R and $r \in R$. If for every $k < m$ we have $\partial_{p^k}(r) = \partial'_{p^k}(r)$, then for any $n < q$ we have $\partial_n(r) = \partial'_n(r)$.*

Proof. Induction on n . Take $n < q$ and assume that for all $k < n$ we have $\partial_k = \partial'_k$. Let $k < m$ be biggest such that $p^k \leq n$. By the assumption we can assume that $n = p^k + l$ for some positive integer l . Then p does not divide $\binom{n}{l}$. By Lemma 3.18, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{p^k}(\partial_l(r)) &= \binom{n}{l} \partial_n(r) + \mathcal{O}(\partial_{<n})(r), \\ \partial'_{p^k}(\partial'_l(r)) &= \binom{n}{l} \partial'_n(r) + \mathcal{O}(\partial'_{<n})(r). \end{aligned}$$

By the induction assumption we get $\partial_n(r) = \partial'_n(r)$. □

Corollary 3.22. *Let ∂ be an f -iterative derivation on R and $r \in R$. If for every $k < m$ we have $\partial_{p^k}(r) = 0$, then for any $n < q$ we have $\partial_n(r) = 0$.*

Remark 3.23. Similarly as before, the appropriate versions of 3.21 and 3.22 for F -derivations are also true.

3.4. Fields of constants. In this subsection we generalize a result of Matsumura [15, Theorem 27.3] saying that the field of constants C of a non-zero derivation ∂ on a field K such that $\partial^{(p)} = 0$ is largest possible i.e. $[K : C] = p$. If ∂ is a truncated HS-derivation or an HS-derivation, then we define its *field of constants* as the intersection of $\ker(\partial_i)$ for all $i \neq 0$. As we know (Remark 2.8), having a derivation ∂ as in [15, Theorem 27.3] is equivalent to having a $\mathbb{G}_a[1]$ -derivation and the both fields of constants coincide. In Proposition 3.27, we generalize Matsumura’s result from $\mathbb{G}_a[1]$ -derivations to f -derivations, where f is an arbitrary truncated group law. Such a generalization will be necessary for integrating truncated HS-derivations.

We will need a slight generalization of a result from [15] (recall that $q = p^m$).

Lemma 3.24. *Let ∂ be a non-zero derivation on a field K . Then the functions $\text{id}_K, \partial^q, \dots, (\partial^{(p-1)})^q$ are linearly independent over K .*

Proof. The case of $m = 0$ is exactly [15, Theorem 25.4]. For the general case it is enough to notice that the K -linear independence of $\text{id}_K, \partial, \dots, \partial^{(p-1)}$ implies the $K^{q^{-1}}$ -linear independence of $\iota, \iota \circ \partial, \dots, \iota \circ \partial^{(p-1)}$, where $\iota : K \rightarrow K^{q^{-1}}$ is the inclusion map. Applying the m -th power of the Frobenius map we get the independence of $\text{id}_K, \partial^q, \dots, (\partial^{(p-1)})^q$ over K . $\square$

The result below is a multiplicative version of a part of [15, Theorem 27.3(ii)].

Lemma 3.25. *Let ∂ be a non-zero derivation on a field K such that $\partial^{(p)} = \partial$. Then there is a non-zero $x \in K$ such that $\partial(x) = x$.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Suppose that $\partial(x) \neq x$ for all non-zero $x \in K$. It means that the map $\partial - \text{id}_K$ is one-to-one. Notice that

$$(\partial - \text{id}_K) \circ (\text{id}_K + \partial + \partial^{(2)} + \dots + \partial^{(p-1)}) = \partial^{(p)} - \text{id}_K = \partial - \text{id}_K.$$

From the injectivity of $\partial - \text{id}_K$, we obtain

$$\text{id}_K + \partial + \partial^{(2)} + \dots + \partial^{(p-1)} = \text{id}_K,$$

which contradicts [15, Theorem 25.4] (see Lemma 3.24 above for $q = 1$). $\square$

Before the next result, we need a very general lemma, which is not particularly related to derivations.

Lemma 3.26. *Let $\partial : R \rightarrow R$ be a function.*

(1) *We have*

$$\partial^{(p-1)} + \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} l^{p-1-i} \partial^{(i)} = 0.$$

(2) *Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that ∂ is additive and $\partial^{(p)} = \partial$. Then*

$$\partial \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} l^{p-1-i} \partial^{(i)} \right) = l \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} l^{p-1-i} \partial^{(i)} \right).$$

Proof. Note that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_p$, since $\alpha^p = \alpha$, we get

$$(*) \quad \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} \alpha^r = \alpha \left(\sum_{r=1}^{p-1} \alpha^r \right).$$

Let ξ be a generator of $\mathbb{F}_p^*$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, p-2\}$. Then we have

$$(**) \quad \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} l^i = \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} (\xi^r)^i = \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} (\xi^i)^r = 0,$$

where the last equality follows from (*) (for $\alpha = \xi^i$), since $\xi^i \neq 1$.

Using (**) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^{(p-1)} + \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} l^{p-1-i} \partial^{(i)} &= \partial^{(p-1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{p-1} l^{p-1-i} \right) \partial^{(i)} \\ &= \partial^{(p-1)} + \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} l^0 \partial^{(p-1)} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (2) is an easy computation which is similar to the one needed to obtain the equality (*) above. $\square$

We prove now the main result of this subsection.

Proposition 3.27. *Let K be a field and ∂ be an f -derivation on K such that ∂_1 is non-zero. Let C be the constant field of ∂ . Then $[K : C] = p^m$.*

Proof. First we show inductively that without loss of generality we can assume that $m = 1$. Assume that $m > 1$ and let $C' = \ker(\partial_1)$. By Corollary 3.4 and Corollary 3.22, $\partial' = (\partial_{pi}|_{C'})_{i < p^{m-1}}$ is an $f'[m-1]$ -derivation on C' , where $f' = f^{\text{Fr}}$. By Lemma 3.18 and Corollary 3.22, the constant field of ∂' coincides with C , so we are done by the inductive assumption and by the $m = 1$ case. Assume that $m = 1$. Lemma 3.18 implies that $C = \ker(\partial_1)$. By Remark 3.17(3), we have $\partial_1^{(p)} = c\partial_1$ for some $c \in k$. The case $\partial_1^{(p)} = 0$ is treated in [15, Theorem 27.3], so we can assume that $c \neq 0$. We assume first that $c = 1$ (which corresponds to the multiplicative case) and will treat the general case at the end of the proof.

Let us take an arbitrary $a \in K$ and let $x \in K \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $\partial(x) = x$ (see Lemma 3.25). By Lemma 3.26(2), we have

$$a = a - \partial^{(p-1)}(a) - \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{x^k} x^k,$$

where $\alpha_k = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} k^{p-1-i} \partial^{(i)}(a)$. By Lemma 3.26(1), we have $\partial(\alpha_k) = k\alpha_k$. Since $\partial(x) = x$, it is easy to see that

$$\partial\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{x^k}\right) = 0.$$

Therefore K is spanned over C by $\{1, x, \dots, x^{p-1}\}$, so $[K : C] = p$.

Let us come back now to the general case when $\partial_1^{(p)} = c\partial_1$ for an arbitrary $c \in k \setminus \{0\}$. Note that for any $d \in C$ and $\partial_d := d\partial$ we have

$$\partial_d^{(p)} = d^p \partial^{(p)} = d^p c \partial = d^{p-1} c \partial_d.$$

(The first equality is easy to see, it is also a special case of the Hochschild formula, see [15, Theorem 25.5].) If $d \neq 0$, then the constants of ∂_d coincide with the constants of ∂ , so we can replace ∂ with ∂_d . Therefore we are done if there is $d \in C$ such that $d^{p-1} = c^{-1}$. Let K' denote the separable closure of K . The derivation ∂ uniquely extends to a derivation ∂' on K' . Let C' denote the field of constants of ∂' . From the uniqueness of extensions of derivations, we get $(\partial')^{(p)} = c\partial'$. Clearly, there is $d \in K'$ such that $d^{p-1} = c^{-1}$. Therefore $[K' : C'] = p$. Since C' is linearly disjoint from K over C (see [10, Corollary 1 p. 87]), we get $[K : C] = p$. $\square$

4. EXPANDING HS-DERIVATIONS

In this section we generalize the result of Matsumura [14, Theorem 7] about strong integrability of certain derivations. Throughout this section $k \subseteq M \subseteq K$ is a tower of fields such that k is perfect (of characteristic $p > 0$) and the extension $M \subseteq K$ is separable (not necessarily algebraic). We fix $m > 0$ and set $q := p^m$.

Our generalization is two-fold:

- (1) From an M -derivation D on K such that $D^{(p)} = 0$ (equivalent to a $\mathbb{G}_a[1]$ -derivation, see Remark 2.8) to any $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivation (Theorem 4.7).
- (2) Analogue of (1) for $\mathbb{G}_m[m]$ -derivations (Theorem 4.11).

It should be mentioned that Proposition 4.5, which is the main technical point needed for (1) above, was essentially obtained by Ziegler in [22, Theorem 1].

It is natural to ask whether similar results can be obtained for any formal group law.

Question 4.1. Let F be a formal group law over k and ∂ be an $F[m]$ -derivation on K . Does ∂ expand to an F -derivation?

Unfortunately, we do not know the answer to this question. In Section 6, we give some evidence why the answer may be negative.

For the notion of a p -basis of an extension of fields of characteristic $p > 0$, the reader may consult [15, p. 202]. The proof of [15, Theorem 27.3(ii)] gives the following.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $M \subseteq L \subseteq K$ be a tower of fields ($M \subseteq K$ separable), $[K : L] = p$, $L \subseteq K$ is purely inseparable and $a \in K \setminus L$. Then we have:*

- (1) *There is $B_0 \subseteq L$ such that $B_0 \cup \{a^p\}$ is a p -basis of L over M .*
- (2) *For any $B_0 \subseteq L$ such that $B_0 \cup \{a^p\}$ is a p -basis of L over M , the set $B_0 \cup \{a\}$ is a p -basis of K over M .*

We will need a generalization of the second part of the lemma above.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M \subseteq K_{m-1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_0 \subseteq K$ be a tower of fields ($M \subseteq K$ separable) such that $K_{m-1} \subseteq K$ is purely inseparable*

$$[K : K_0] = [K_0 : K_1] = \dots = [K_{m-2} : K_{m-1}] = p.$$

Let $x \in K$ be such that for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, we have $x^{p^i} \notin K_i$. Then there is $B_0 \subseteq K_{m-1}$ such that $B_0 \cup \{x\}$ is a p -basis of K over M .

Proof. Clearly, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, the extension $M \subseteq K_i$ is separable. Using Lemma 4.2(1) for $a = x^{p^{m-1}}$ and $M \subseteq K_{m-1} \subseteq K_{m-2}$, we get $B_0 \subseteq K_{m-1}$ such that $B_0 \cup \{x^{p^m}\}$ is a p -basis of K over M . Using Lemma 4.2(2) and the downward induction on i , we get that $B_0 \cup \{x\}$ is a p -basis of K over M . $\square$

For the remainder of this section we consider only the additive and the multiplicative laws, so we can assume that k is the prime field $\mathbb{F}_p$.

4.1. Additive case. We will need one fact about derivations.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that ∂ is a non-zero derivation on K such that $\partial^{(p)} = 0$. Then*

$$\text{im}(\partial) = \ker(\partial^{(p-1)}).$$

Proof. Let $C = \ker(\partial)$. By [15, Theorem 27.3], (see also Proposition 3.27) $[K : C] = p$. Clearly $\text{im}(\partial) \subseteq \ker(\partial^{(p-1)})$. It is enough to show that

$$\dim_C \text{im}(\partial) \geq \dim_C \ker(\partial^{(p-1)}).$$

By [15, Theorem 25.4] (see also Lemma 3.24), $\partial^{(p-1)} \neq 0$, so $\dim_C \ker(\partial^{(p-1)}) \leq p-1$.

By [15, Theorem 27.3(ii)], there is $x \in K$ such that $\partial(x) = 1$ (namely, $x = \partial^{(i-1)}(z)/\partial^{(i)}(z)$ for $z \in K \setminus C$ and $i > 0$ such that $\partial^{(i)}(z) \neq 0$ and $\partial^{(i+1)}(z) = 0$). Therefore, $\partial(x^n) = nx^{n-1}$ for $n = 0, \dots, p-1$ and $1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{p-2}$ are linearly independent over C . Hence $\dim_C(\text{im}(\partial)) \geq p-1$. $\square$

We show now that any $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivation has something in common with the canonical one.

Proposition 4.5. *Let ∂ be a $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivation on K such that ∂_1 is non-zero. Then there is $x \in K$ such that*

$$\partial_1(x) = 1, \quad \partial_2(x) = 0, \quad \dots, \quad \partial_{q-1}(x) = 0.$$

Proof. Induction on m . The case of $m = 1$ is [15, Theorem 27.3(ii)]. Assume that the proposition is true for m and take a $\mathbb{G}_a[m+1]$ -derivation ∂ on K over k such that ∂_1 is non-zero. Let $\partial' = (\partial_i)_{i < p^m}$. By Corollary 3.4(2), ∂' is a $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivation. By the inductive assumption, there is $x \in K$ such that

$$(*) \quad \partial_1(x) = 1, \quad \partial_2(x) = 0, \quad \dots, \quad \partial_{p^m-1}(x) = 0.$$

Let C be the field of constants of ∂ and C' the field of constants of ∂' . By higher Leibnitz rules, ∂_{p^m} is a C -derivation on C' . It is easy to see that ∂_{p^m} is non-zero on C' , since $x^{p^m} \in C'$ and

$$\partial_{p^m}(x^{p^m}) = \partial_1(x)^{p^m} \neq 0.$$

By Remark 3.15(1), $\partial_{p^m}^{(p)} = 0$, so by Lemma 4.4 we have

$$(**) \quad \partial_{p^m}(C') = \ker(\partial_{p^m}^{(p-1)}) \cap C'.$$

Since $\partial_{p^m}^{(p)} = 0$, we have $\partial_{p^m}(x) \in \ker(\partial_{p^m}^{(p-1)})$. Since ∂_{p^m} commutes with $\partial_1, \dots, \partial_{p^m-1}$, we get by (*) that $\partial_{p^m}(x) \in C'$. By (**), there is $y \in C'$ such that

$$\partial_{p^m}(y) = \partial_{p^m}(x).$$

Let $z := y - x$. It is clear that

$$\partial_1(z) = 1, \quad \partial_2(z) = 0, \quad \dots, \quad \partial_{p^m}(z) = 0.$$

By the iterativity rule, for any $i < (p-1)p^m$ we also have $\partial_{p^m+i}(z) = 0$. $\square$

We will call an element $x \in K$ satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 4.5, a *canonical* element for a $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivation ∂ .

Remark 4.6. Ziegler in [22] and [23] defines the notion of a *canonical p -basis* which in our “ordinary” (i.e. one HS-derivation) case reduces to the notion of a canonical element. For the sake of clarity we restrain ourselves from considering the case of several HS-derivations, see Section 7.

We can prove now our additive integrability theorem. Let us recall that $K \subseteq M$ is a separable (not necessarily algebraic) extension of fields.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\partial = (\partial_i)_{i < p^m}$ be a $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivation on K over M . Then ∂ can be expanded to a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation on K over M .*

Proof. Let us assume first that ∂_1 is non-zero. The proof in this case is similar to the proof of [14, Theorem 7]. Take a canonical element $x \in K$ from Proposition 4.5. For $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ let us define

$$K_i := \bigcap_{j < p^{i+1}} \ker(\partial_j).$$

By Proposition 3.27, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, we have $[K : K_i] = p^{i+1}$ and

$$\partial_{p^i}(x^{p^i}) = \partial_1(x)^{p^i} = 1 \neq 0,$$

so $x^{p^i} \notin K_i$. Hence $M, K_{m-1}, \dots, K_0, K, x$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 4.3, therefore there is $B_0 \subset K_{m-1}$ such that $B := B_0 \cup \{x\}$ is a p -basis of K over M . By [15, Theorem 26.8] x is transcendental over $M(B_0)$, so we can define a canonical $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation on $M(B)$ over $M(B_0)$ (see Proposition 3.6). By [15, Theorem 26.8] again, $M(B) \subseteq K$ is étale, so by [15, Theorem 27.2] our canonical $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivations uniquely extends to a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation D on K over M . Since for any $i < q$, ∂_i coincides with D_i on B (therefore on $M(B)$ as well), it is easy to see that they coincide on K .

Let us now consider the case $\partial_1 = 0$. Obviously, we can assume that ∂_i is non-zero for some $0 < i < p^m$. By Lemma 3.18 and Corollary 3.22, there is $j < m$ such that $\partial_1 = \dots = \partial_{p^j-1} = 0$ but ∂_{p^j} is non-zero. Let $l := m - j$ and $\partial' = (\partial_{ip^j})_{i < p^l}$. By Corollary 3.4(4) and Corollary 3.22, ∂' is a $\mathbb{G}_m[l]$ -derivation (since $(X+Y)^{\text{Fr}^{-j}}$ clearly coincides with $X+Y$). Since ∂'_1 is non-zero, by the first part of the proof ∂' expands to a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation $D' = (D'_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Define $D = (D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $D_i = D'_{i/p^j}$ for i divisible by p^j and $D_i = 0$ otherwise. Using the map

$$\text{ev}_{X^{p^l}} : K[[X]] \rightarrow K[[X]],$$

which gives a morphism from $\mathbb{G}_a$ to $\mathbb{G}_a$ and Lemma 3.2, we see that D is a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation. By the construction, D expands ∂ . $\square$

4.2. Multiplicative case. In this subsection we prove an analogue of Theorem 4.7 for multiplicatively iterative derivations. The general scheme of the proof is the same as in the additive case: the main point is to find a canonical element (in the appropriate, multiplicative sense) for a truncated multiplicatively iterative HS-derivation, this is done in Proposition 4.10.

The lemma below does not require any iterativity assumption. For reader's convenience we point out that this lemma describes a certain function in variable y by introducing new parameters $r_0, \dots, r_{j-1}$ which depend on the original parameter x .

Lemma 4.8. *Let ∂ be an m -truncated HS-derivation on a ring R . For any $i < m$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in R$, there are $r_0, \dots, r_{j-1} \in R$ such that for all $y \in R$ we have*

$$(*) \quad \partial_{p^i}^{(j)}(y^{p^i} x) = \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} r_l \partial_1^{(l)}(y)^{p^i} + x \partial_1^{(j)}(y)^{p^i}.$$

Proof. Induction on j . The case $j = 0$ is clear. Assume that $(*)$ above holds and set $r_j = x$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{p^i}^{(j+1)}(y^{p^i}x) &= \sum_{l=0}^j r_l \partial_{p^i}(\partial_1^{(l)}(y)^{p^i}) + \partial_{p^i}(r_l) \partial_1^{(l)}(y)^{p^i} \\ &= \partial_{p^i}(r_0)y^{p^i} + \sum_{l=1}^j (r_{l-1} + \partial_{p^i}(r_l)) \partial_1^{(l)}(y)^{p^i} + r_j \partial_1^{(j+1)}(y)^{p^i}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $r_j = x$, the lemma is proved. $\square$

Lemma 4.9. *Let ∂ be a $\mathbb{G}_m[m]$ -derivation on a ring R and $i \in \{0, \dots, m-2\}$. Assume that $x \in R$ satisfies*

$$\partial_1(x) = x, \quad \partial_p(x) = 0, \quad \dots, \quad \partial_{p^i}(x) = 0.$$

Take any $y \in R$ and let $x' := y^{p^{i+1}}x - \partial_{p^{i+1}}^{(p-1)}(y^{p^{i+1}}x)$. Then we have:

$$\partial_1(x') = x', \quad \partial_p(x') = 0, \quad \dots, \quad \partial_{p^{i+1}}(x') = 0.$$

Proof. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_1(x') &= y^{p^{i+1}}\partial_1(x) - \partial_{p^{i+1}}^{(p-1)}(y^{p^{i+1}}\partial_1(x)) \\ &= y^{p^{i+1}}x - \partial_{p^{i+1}}^{(p-1)}(y^{p^{i+1}}x) \\ &= x';\end{aligned}$$

$$\partial_{p^{i+1}}(x') = \partial_{p^{i+1}}(y^{p^{i+1}}x) - \partial_{p^{i+1}}^{(p)}(y^{p^{i+1}}x) = 0.$$

It is easy to see that $\partial_{p^j}(x') = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, i$. $\square$

We show below that canonical elements for $\mathbb{G}_m[m]$ -derivations exist as well.

Proposition 4.10. *Assume that ∂ is a $\mathbb{G}_m[m]$ -derivation such that ∂_1 is non-zero. Then there is $x \in K$ such that*

$$\partial_1(x) = x + 1 \neq 0, \quad \partial_2(x) = 0, \quad \dots, \quad \partial_{q-1}(x) = 0.$$

Proof. First, we inductively construct a sequence $x_0, \dots, x_{m-1} \in K \setminus \{0\}$ such that for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ we have

$$(*) \quad \partial_1(x_i) = x_i, \quad \partial_p(x_i) = 0, \quad \dots, \quad \partial_{p^i}(x_i) = 0.$$

Using Lemma 3.25, we get a non-zero $x_0 \in K$ such that $\partial_1(x_0) = x_0$. Assume that $i < m-1$ and that we have a non-zero $x_i \in K$ satisfying $(*)$. By Lemma 3.24 and Lemma 4.8, there is $y \in K$ such that

$$x_{i+1} := y^{p^{i+1}}x_i - \partial_{p^{i+1}}^{(p-1)}(y^{p^{i+1}}x_i)$$

is non-zero. By Lemma 4.9, the element x_{i+1} satisfies $(*)_{i+1}$.

Let $x := x_{m-1} - 1$. Then we have

$$0 \neq x_{m-1} = \partial_1(x) = x + 1.$$

Clearly $\partial_{p^i}(x) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$. Since $\partial_1(x) \neq 0$, x is necessarily transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_p$. By Example 3.8, there is a canonical $\mathbb{G}_m$ -derivation ∂' on $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$. Hence $\partial_{p^i}(x) = \partial'_{p^i}(x)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$. By Lemma 3.21, $\partial_n(x) = \partial'_n(x)$ for $n < p^m - 1$, hence $\partial_n(x) = 0$ for $n \in \{2, \dots, p^m - 1\}$. $\square$

We have now all the ingredients to prove a multiplicative version of Theorem 4.7. Since the proof is exactly the same as the proof of Theorem 4.7, we will skip it.

Theorem 4.11. *Let $M \subseteq K$ be a separable field extension and ∂ a $\mathbb{G}_m[m]$ -derivation on K over k . Then ∂ can be expanded to a $\mathbb{G}_m$ -derivation on K over M .*

5. GROUP SCHEME ACTIONS

In this section, we interpret the definitions from Section 2 in terms of group scheme actions. We hope that the group-schematic point of view may help to answer Question 4.1 *negatively*. A result in this direction is proven in Section 6.

We again fix a field k of positive characteristic $p > 0$ and a k -algebra R . We also fix a complete local k -algebra $\mathcal{R}$ with the maximal ideal I and $m > 0$.

5.1. Definitions and bijective correspondences. The category of *affine group schemes* over k is the category opposite to the category of *Hopf algebras* over k [21, Section 1.4] (or it is the category of representable functors from k -algebras to groups, see [21, Section 1.2]). A *truncated group scheme* [2] over k is an affine group scheme whose universe is of the form

$$\mathrm{Spec}(k[v_{m_1}, \dots, v_{m_k}]) = \mathrm{Spec}(k[X_1, \dots, X_k]/(X_1^{p^{m_1}}, \dots, X_k^{p^{m_k}})).$$

By [21, 14.4] such group schemes coincide with finite connected group schemes (called *infinitesimal* in [3] and *local* in [13]). In this paper we mostly consider truncated group scheme structures on $\mathrm{Spec}(k[v_m])$ (the “ordinary” case). Any m -truncated group law f naturally gives a truncated group scheme G_f corresponding to the Hopf algebra with the following comultiplication map

$$\mathrm{ev}_f(v_m \otimes 1, 1 \otimes v_m) : k[v_m] \rightarrow k[v_m] \otimes k[v_m].$$

To go to the opposite direction, one needs to choose a generator of $k[v_m]$.

Remark 5.1. If $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$, then by a theorem of Cartier [21, Section 11.4] all Hopf algebras over k are reduced, so there are no truncated group schemes.

The category of *formal groups* over k is the category opposite to the category of *complete Hopf algebras* over k (or the category of representable functors from complete k -algebras to groups, see [7, Chapter VII]). Similarly as in the truncated case, there is a correspondence between formal groups and formal group laws. Note that a truncated group scheme is both an affine group scheme and a formal group. Let f be a truncated group law over k giving a truncated group scheme G_f . There is a natural correspondence between:

- (1) The set of all f -derivations on R .
- (2) The set of all k -group scheme actions of G_f on $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$.

Since a formal group law F can be approximated by a direct system of truncated group laws $F[m]$ (for a more precise statement, see Section 5.2), we get the similar correspondences between:

- (1) The set of all F -derivations on R .
- (2) The set of all systems of compatible k -group scheme actions of $G_{F[m]}$ on $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ for $m > 0$.

Remark 5.2. In this setting, it is clear that Lemma 3.2 and Remark 3.3 correspond to elementary properties of group actions on sets.

For an arbitrary k -scheme V it makes sense to talk about f -derivations or F -derivations on V using the conditions of type (2) above.

Consider the *automorphism functor* $A_{V/k}$, associated to a k -scheme V , between the category of k -schemes and the category of groups. For a k -scheme W , we have

$$A_{V/k}(W) = \text{Aut}_W(V \times_k W)$$

(see [16, page 11]). If this functor is representable we denote the representing k -group scheme by $\text{Aut}_k(V)$. Assume that $A_{V/k}$ is representable. Then we have a third equivalent condition in the case of a truncated group law f :

- (3) The set of all k -group scheme morphisms $G_f \rightarrow \text{Aut}_k(V)$.

Similarly in the case of a formal group law F :

- (3) The set of all compatible systems of k -group scheme morphisms $G_{F[m]} \rightarrow \text{Aut}_k(V)$.

Remark 5.3. We point out two cases (special cases of [16, Theorem 3.7]) when the functor $A_{V/k}$ is representable:

- V is a projective variety over k ;
- $V = \text{Spec}(K)$ such that the extension $k \subseteq K$ is finite (including inseparable extensions!).

We hoped that using “truncated Galois groups” from [2] one could answer Question 4.1 negatively for certain formal group laws, but we could not accomplish it.

5.2. Truncations of group schemes. Let G be an affine group scheme over k , H the corresponding Hopf algebra, $\mathfrak{m}$ be the kernel of the counit map $H \rightarrow k$ (the *augmentation ideal*) and $m > 0$. By the base-change given by the automorphism $\text{Fr}^m : k \rightarrow k$ we get the affine group scheme $G^{(m)}$ over k and a group scheme morphism $\text{Fr}_G^m : G \rightarrow G^{(m)}$. Let $G[m]$ be the kernel of Fr_G^m which is a truncated k -group scheme. It corresponds to the quotient Hopf algebra

$$H[m] := H / \text{Fr}^m(\mathfrak{m})H.$$

We get a direct system of truncated k -group schemes $(G[m])_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$. If G is an algebraic group over k , then $\varinjlim (G[m])$ coincides with $\widehat{G}$, the formal group which is the formalization of G (it follows from [13, Lemma 1.1]).

We abuse the language a little bit here (in the case of a one-dimensional algebraic group G) identifying the formal group law $\widehat{G}$ (as defined in Section 2.1) with the corresponding formal group.

Similarly for a complete Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}$, we have the analogous quotient $\mathcal{H}[m]$ which is again a Hopf algebra and also a complete Hopf algebra. Hence for a formal group $\mathcal{F}$, we have a direct system of truncated group schemes $\mathcal{F}[m]$ and in this case we get that $\mathcal{F} = \varinjlim \mathcal{F}[m]$, see [13, Lemma 1.1] again.

These truncated group schemes correspond to the truncated group laws from Section 2.3, i.e. for any m -truncated group law f and $l \leq m$ we have $G_f[l] \cong G_{f[l]}$ and similarly for any formal group law F and the corresponding formal group $\mathcal{F}$, we have $G_{F[m]} \cong \mathcal{F}[m]$.

5.3. Rational points of formal groups. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a formal group over k corresponding to a complete Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}$. By $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R})$ (the set of “ $\mathcal{R}$ -rational points” of $\mathcal{F}$) we denote the set of all continuous k -algebra morphisms from $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{R}$. From general categorical reasons, $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R})$ is a group. If $\mathcal{F}$ comes from a formal group law F , then $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R})$ naturally corresponds to I and the operation on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R})$ corresponds to

$$I \times I \ni (a, b) \mapsto F(a, b) \in I$$

(see [7, Section 1.3]).

We note some properties of these groups.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\alpha : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$ be a morphism of formal groups and G an algebraic group over k . We have:*

- (1) *The induced map $\alpha : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'(\mathcal{R})$ is a homomorphism of groups.*
- (2) *There is a natural monomorphism of groups $\widehat{G}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow G(\mathcal{R})$.*

Proof. Since the first part is clear, we comment only on (2). For simplicity, we assume that $G = \text{Spec}(H)$ is affine. Then $\widehat{G}$ corresponds to $\widehat{H}$, where the completion is taken with respect to the augmentation ideal of the Hopf algebra H . Since the map $H \rightarrow \widehat{H}$ is a k -algebra map and any continuous homomorphism $\widehat{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is determined by its values on H , we get a one-to-one map $\widehat{G}(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow G(\mathcal{R})$. An easy diagram chase shows that this map is a homomorphism of groups. $\square$

6. ITERATIVE DERIVATIONS ON PROJECTIVE LINE

Assume that k is a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$ and m is a positive integer. In this section we discuss integrability of truncated HS-derivations on projective line $\mathbb{P}^1 = \mathbb{P}_k^1$. A (truncated) HS-derivation on $\mathbb{P}^1$ is by definition a (truncated) HS-derivation on the structure sheaf of $\mathbb{P}^1$ (see [12]). It is very easy to describe (truncated) HS-derivations on $\mathbb{P}^1$: they correspond to (truncated) HS-derivations ∂ over k on the polynomial algebra $k[t]$ such that ∂ preserves (after taking the unique extension to $k(t)$) the subalgebra $k[1/t]$. For a usual derivation D the above condition means that $\deg(D(t)) \leq 2$ which geometrically corresponds to the fact that the tangent bundle of projective line coincides with the line bundle $\mathcal{O}(2)$. Such an (truncated) HS-derivation on $\mathbb{P}^1$ satisfies a given iterativity condition if and only if the corresponding (truncated) HS-derivation on $k[t]$ does.

We note a projective version of our integrability results.

Theorem 6.1. *Let ∂ be a $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivation (resp. $\mathbb{G}_m[m]$ -derivation) on $\mathbb{P}^1$. Then ∂ can be expanded to a $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation (resp. $\mathbb{G}_m$ -derivation).*

Proof. Let us fix ∂ , a $\mathbb{G}_a[m]$ -derivation or a $\mathbb{G}_m[m]$ -derivation on $\mathbb{P}^1$ and we also denote by ∂ the corresponding m -truncated HS-derivation on $k(t)$. By Propositions 4.5 and 4.10, there is a canonical element $a \in k(t)$ for ∂ . To finish the proof as in Theorem 4.7, it is enough to notice that the canonical $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation and the canonical $\mathbb{G}_m$ -derivation preserve $k[1/t]$. It is well-known in the additive case and in any case it follows by induction from the formula ($n > 0$)

$$0 = \partial_n(tt^{-1}) = t\partial_n(t^{-1}) + \partial_1(t)\partial_{n-1}(t^{-1}),$$

since $\partial_1(t) = 1$ or $\partial_1(t) = t + 1$ and $\partial_i(t) = 0$ for $i > 1$. $\square$

We will show that for most of the other iterativity rules, truncated HS-derivations on $\mathbb{P}^1$ can not be integrated. It will follow from the result below saying that the existence of a non-trivial F -derivation on $\mathbb{P}^1$ is quite a restrictive condition on a formal group law F . For the notion of the height of a formal group law we refer the reader to [7, 18.3.3].

Theorem 6.2. *Let F be a formal group law over k . If there is a non-trivial F -derivation on $\mathbb{P}^1$, then $\text{ht}(F) = 1$ or $\text{ht}(F) = \infty$.*

Proof. Assume that there is a non-trivial F -derivation on $\mathbb{P}^1$. Since the height of a formal group law does not change after a base-change, we can assume that k is algebraically closed. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the formal group corresponding to F . By [16, page 21], the automorphism functor $A_{\mathbb{P}^1/k}$ is representable by the linear algebraic group $\text{PGL}(2, k)$. Let H be the Hopf algebra of $\text{PGL}(2, k)$ and $\mathcal{H}$ the complete Hopf algebra corresponding to $\mathcal{F}$ (so $\mathcal{H}$ is isomorphic to the power series ring in one variable t and the complete Hopf algebra structure is given by $t \mapsto F(t \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes t)$). By a bijective correspondence from Section 5.1, we get a compatible system of k -group scheme morphisms

$$\mathcal{F}[m] \rightarrow \text{Aut}_k(\mathbb{P}^1) = \text{PGL}(2, k).$$

For each m , the above morphism factors through a morphism

$$\mathcal{F}[m] \rightarrow \text{PGL}(2, k)[m],$$

since the morphism $\mathcal{F}[m] \rightarrow \text{PGL}(2, k)$ composed with $\text{Fr}_{\text{PGL}(2, k)}^m$ is the trivial morphism and

$$\text{PGL}(2, k)[m] = \ker(\text{Fr}_{\text{PGL}(2, k)}^m)$$

(see Section 5.2). Since we have

$$\varinjlim (\mathcal{F}[m]) \cong \mathcal{F}, \quad \varinjlim (\text{PGL}(2, k)[m]) \cong \widehat{\text{PGL}(2, k)}$$

(see Section 5.2), we get a non-trivial morphism of formal groups

$$\Psi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \widehat{\text{PGL}(2, k)}.$$

We proceed to show that the ‘‘Zariski closure of the image of Ψ ’’ is a commutative algebraic subgroup V of $\text{PGL}(2, K)$ and that Ψ factors through a formal group morphism $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \widehat{V}$.

Let Φ be dual to Ψ , $\mathcal{I}$ the kernel of Φ , $I = \mathcal{I} \cap H$ and R the quotient of H by I . We have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{I} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \widehat{H} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \Phi \\ R & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{H} \\ \downarrow & \nearrow \alpha & \\ \widehat{R}, & & \end{array}$$

where the completion of R is taken with respect to the image of the maximal ideal in the local ring of $1 \in \mathrm{PGL}(2, k)$. Since Φ is non-trivial (i.e. $\Phi(\widehat{H}) \neq k$), the induced map $\alpha : \widehat{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is non-trivial as well.

Let V be the closed subvariety of $\mathrm{PGL}(2, k)$ corresponding to $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$. The above diagram means exactly that Φ factors through a morphism $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \widehat{V}$ whose image is “Zariski dense in V ” (since $R \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is one-to-one). We need to show that V is a commutative algebraic subgroup of $\mathrm{PGL}(2, k)$.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a complete k -algebra which is DVR and K the algebraic closure of its field of fractions. Clearly, $\mathcal{H} \widehat{\otimes}_k \mathcal{R} \cong \mathcal{R}[[t]]$ as complete $\mathcal{R}$ -algebras. After base-change, we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H \otimes_k \mathcal{R} & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \widehat{H} \widehat{\otimes}_k \mathcal{R} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \Phi_{\mathcal{R}} \\ R \otimes_k \mathcal{R} & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & \mathcal{H} \widehat{\otimes}_k \mathcal{R} \\ & \searrow \gamma_a & \downarrow \mathrm{ev}_a \\ & & \mathcal{R}, \end{array}$$

where γ is still an embedding, since $\mathcal{R}$ is flat over k . For any a belonging to the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{R}$, we have the evaluation map $\mathrm{ev}_a : \mathcal{R}[[t]] \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ and we denote the composition of this map with γ by $\gamma_a \in V(\mathcal{R})$.

The set of all evaluation maps as above forms a commutative group $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R})$ (see Section 5.3). By Lemma 5.4,

$$\Gamma := \beta^*(\Psi^*(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R})))$$

is a commutative subgroup of $\mathrm{PGL}(2, \mathcal{R})$. Using the natural embedding of $V(\mathcal{R})$ into $\mathrm{PGL}(2, \mathcal{R})$ we see that $\Gamma \subseteq V(\mathcal{R})$. However γ is an embedding and for any $T \in \mathcal{R}[[t]]$ there is a in the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{R}$ such that $T(a) \neq 0$ (either $a = 0$ or a in the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{R}$ works). Hence for any $r \in R$ there is $\gamma_a \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma_a(r) \neq 0$. It means that Γ is Zariski dense in $V(K)$. It is well-known (see e.g. [1, Chapter 1 §2]) that the Zariski closure of a commutative subgroup of an algebraic group is a commutative subgroup. Hence V is a commutative algebraic subgroup of $\mathrm{PGL}(2, k)$ and $\Psi : F \rightarrow \widehat{\mathrm{PGL}(2, k)}$ factors through a formal group morphism $F \rightarrow \widehat{V}$.

By considering upper triangular matrices of determinant one, one sees that Borel subgroups of $\mathrm{PGL}(2, k)$ are isomorphic to $\mathbb{G}_a \rtimes \mathbb{G}_m$. Hence V is isomorphic either to $\mathbb{G}_a$ or to $\mathbb{G}_m$. The classification of commutative formal groups up to isogeny [13, Chapter II §4] gives then $F \cong \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_a$ or $F \cong \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$ that is (see [7, Theorem 18.5.1]) $\mathrm{ht}(F) = 1$ or $\mathrm{ht}(F) = \infty$. $\square$

Remark 6.3. Using properties of commutative linear groups (see e.g. [1]), one can generalize Theorem 6.2 from $\mathbb{P}^1$ to any k -scheme W such that $A_{W/k}$ is representable by a linear algebraic group over k (e.g. $W = \mathbb{P}^n$).

Corollary 6.4. *Let F be a formal group law over k . If $\mathrm{ht}(F) \neq 1$ and $\mathrm{ht}(F) \neq \infty$, then there is an $F[1]$ -derivation on $\mathbb{P}^1$ which does not expand to an F -derivation.*

Proof. By [3, Theorem p. 69], there are (up to isomorphism) only two k -group scheme structures on $\mathrm{Spec}(k[X]/(X^p))$:

$$\mathbb{G}_a[1] := \ker(\mathrm{Fr} : \mathbb{G}_a \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a), \quad \mathbb{G}_m[1] := \ker(\mathrm{Fr} : \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m),$$

since the Dieudonné module of such a group scheme coincides with k (length 1), the Frobenius map is 0 and the Verschiebung map is either 0 or 1. If F is a formal group law over k and $\mathrm{ht}(F) = 1$, then $F[1] \cong \mathbb{G}_m[1]$ (Verschiebung is 1), otherwise $F[1] \cong \mathbb{G}_a[1]$ (Verschiebung is 0).

Let us assume that $\mathrm{ht}(F) \neq 1$ and $\mathrm{ht}(F) \neq \infty$. Therefore $F[1] \cong \mathbb{G}_a[1]$ (since $\mathrm{ht}(F) \neq 1$). Since the standard derivation on $k[t]$ gives a non-zero derivation on $\mathbb{P}^1$, we have a non-zero $\mathbb{G}_a[1]$ -derivation ∂ on $\mathbb{P}^1$. Since $F[1] \cong \mathbb{G}_a[1]$, ∂ is also an $F[1]$ -derivation. By Theorem 6.2, this derivation does not expand to an F -derivation. $\square$

Remark 6.5. Results of this section may look related to isotriviality theorems from [12]. However, there is a fundamental difference. In [12], a different type of HS-derivations on projective varieties is considered – their restriction to the base field is *generic* (i.e. this restriction gives an existentially closed structure). In this paper such a restriction is the 0-derivation, which is very non-generic. Clearly, the proofs are related since they both use the automorphism functor.

7. SEVERAL HS-DERIVATIONS

We could have extended the results of Section 4 to the case of several iterative HS-derivations. For example, the crucial notion of a canonical element would be replaced with the notion of a *canonical p -basis* as in [23]. However, we feel that such a generalization would not be a satisfactory one. For example, a tuple of e commuting $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivations is the same as a “ $\mathbb{G}_a^e$ -derivation”, see [17, Prop. 2.20]. Therefore one should consider G -derivations for an arbitrary (not necessarily commutative!) algebraic group or even a formal group. Such sequences of HS-derivations will be studied in a future paper.

It may be also interesting to compare Pierce’s theory of several derivations in arbitrary characteristic [18] where the composition of derivations is governed by a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with the theory of G -derivations for $\mathrm{Lie}(G) = \mathfrak{g}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. BOREL. “Linear Algebraic Groups”. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag (1991).
- [2] S. U. CHASE. Infinitesimal group scheme actions on finite field extensions. *American Journal of Mathematics* **98**(2), 441–480 (1976).
- [3] M. DEMAZURE. “Lectures on p -divisible groups”, vol. 302 of “Lecture Notes in Mathematics”. Springer-Verlag (1972).
- [4] D. EISENBUD. “Commutative Algebra with a View Towards Algebraic Geometry”. Springer (1996).
- [5] H. GILLET. Differential algebra: A scheme theory approach. In “Differential Algebra and Related Topics”, pp. 95–123. World Sci., River Edge, N.J., Newark, N.J. (2002).
- [6] D. HASSE. Theorie der höheren Differentiale in einem algebraischen Funktionenkörper mit vollkommenem Konstantenkörper bei beliebiger Charakteristik. *J. reine und angew. Math.* **175**, 50–54 (1936).
- [7] M. HAZEWINKEL. “Formal Groups and Applications”. Academic Press (1978).
- [8] W. HODGES. “A shorter model theory”. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1997).

- [9] D. HOFFMANN AND P. KOWALSKI. Existentially closed fields with G -derivations. In preparation.
- [10] E. KOLCHIN. “Differential Algebra and Algebraic Groups”. Pure and applied mathematics. Academic Press (1973).
- [11] P. KOWALSKI. Geometric axioms for existentially closed Hasse fields. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* **135**, 286–302 (2005).
- [12] P. KOWALSKI AND A. PILLAY. On the isotriviality of projective iterative ∂ -varieties. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **216**(1), 20–27 (2012).
- [13] Y. I. MANIN. The theory of commutative formal groups over fields of finite characteristic. *Russ. Math. Surv.* **18**(6), 1–83 (1963).
- [14] H. MATSUMURA. Integrable derivations. *Nagoya Math. J.* **87**, 227–245 (1982).
- [15] H. MATSUMURA. “Commutative ring theory”. Cambridge University Press (1986).
- [16] H. MATSUMURA AND F. OORT. Representability of group functors, and automorphisms of algebraic schemes. *Inventiones Math.* **4**, 1–24 (1967).
- [17] R. MOOSA AND T. SCANLON. Generalized Hasse-Schmidt varieties and their jet spaces. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **103**(2), 197–234 (2011).
- [18] D. PIERCE. Fields with several commuting derivations, preprint. Available on <http://mat.msgsu.edu.tr/~dpierce/Mathematics/Derivations/Revisited/>.
- [19] F. SCHMIDT AND D. HASSE. Noch eine Begründung der Theorie der höheren Differentialquotienten in einem algebraischen Funktionenkörper einer Unbestimmten. *J. reine und angew. Math.* **177**, 215–237 (1937).
- [20] J. H. SILVERMAN. “The Arithmetic of Elliptic Curves”. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag (1986).
- [21] W. C. WATERHOUSE. “Introduction to Affine Group Schemes”. Springer-Verlag (1979).
- [22] M. ZIEGLER. Canonical p -bases, preprint. Available on <http://home.mathematik.uni-freiburg.de/ziegler/preprints/canonical-p-bases.pdf>.
- [23] M. ZIEGLER. Separably closed fields with Hasse derivations. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* **68**, 311–318 (2003).

E-mail address: [†]daniel.max.hoffmann@gmail.com

♣INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY, UNIWERSYTET WROCŁAWSKI, WROCŁAW, POLAND

E-mail address: pkowa@math.uni.wroc.pl

URL: <http://www.math.uni.wroc.pl/~pkowa/>